

SEC. 402. SPECIAL RULES REGARDING IMPLEMENTATION OF CERTAIN AMENDMENTS.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION FOR 2000 CROP YEAR.—The amendments made by the following sections of this Act shall apply beginning with the 2000 crop year:

(1) Section 104, relating to review and adjustment in rating methodologies.

(2) Section 106, relating to cost of production as a price election.

(3) Section 107, relating to premium discounts for good performance.

(4) Section 202, relating to improving program compliance and integrity.

(5) Section 203, relating to sanctions for false information.

(6) Section 204, relating to protection of confidential information.

(7) Section 205, relating to records and reporting.

(8) Section 206, relating to compliance with State licensing requirements.

(9) Section 309, relating to requirement to follow good farming practices.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.—The amendments made by the following sections of this Act shall apply beginning with fiscal year 2000:

(1) Section 105(a), relating to repeal of obsolete pilot programs.

(2) Subsections (a), (b), and (c) and section 305, relating to Board consideration of submitted policies and materials.

(3) Section 306, relating to contracting for rating plans of insurance.

(4) Section 307, relating to electronic availability of crop insurance information.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION FOR 2001 CROP YEAR.—The amendments made by the following sections of this Act shall apply beginning with the 2001 crop year:

(1) Section 101, relating to premium schedule for additional coverage.

(2) Section 102, relating to premium schedule for other plans of insurance.

(3) Section 103(b), relating to adjustment in production history to reflect pest control.

(4) Section 109, relating to authority for nonprofit associations to pay fees on behalf of producers.

(5) Section 110, relating to elections regarding prevented planting coverage.

(6) Section 111, relating to limitations under noninsured crop disaster assistance program.

(7) Section 201, relating to limitation on double insurance.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.—The amendments made by the following sections of this Act shall apply beginning with fiscal year 2001:

(1) Section 105(b), relating to general requirements applicable to pilot programs.

(2) Section 304, relating to funding for reimbursement and research and development.

SEC. 403. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

The Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) and section 196 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333), as in effect on day before the date of the enactment of this Act, shall continue to apply with respect to the 1999 crop year and shall apply with respect to the 2000 crop year, to the extent the application of an amendment made by this Act is delayed under section 402 or by the terms of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

□ 1300

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCHUGH) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATOURETTE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2559) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to strengthen the safety net for agricultural producers by providing greater access to more affordable risk management tools and improved protection from production and income loss, to improve the efficiency and integrity of the Federal crop insurance program, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 308, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2559, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2559, AGRICULTURAL RISK PROTECTION ACT OF 1999

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 2559, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, citations, and cross references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without prejudice to the resumption of regular

legislative business, under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FLETCHER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed with my 5-minute special order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

WE SHOULD NOT SPEND SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS MONEY ON OTHER GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we have significant challenges before this legislature, possibly more than any of the 7 years that I have served in Congress. That challenge is to hold the line on spending. The question before this body is should we spend the Social Security surplus money for other government programs.

And, Mr. Speaker, everybody should understand that when Congress spends more money, most often they are more likely to be reelected. They take home pork barrel projects, they do more things for more people with taxpayers' money, and they end up on the front page of the paper or end up on television cutting the ribbons; and so part of the problem is that there is a lot of Members of Congress supported by a lot of bureaucrats that work within Federal Government, all of whom would very much like to spend more money and have a bigger government.

The challenge facing us this year is a budget resolution decision not to spend

the Social Security surplus funds coming in. We are now approaching the new fiscal year. Day after tomorrow the new fiscal year starts for the United States Government. In that budget we now anticipate \$148 billion coming in surplus from the FICA tax, from the Social Security tax. We now estimate approximately \$14 billion coming in surplus from the on-budget surplus or, if you will, from the income tax.

In our budget resolution we said we were not going to spend the Social Security surplus. We passed what was called a lockbox bill on the floor that says that we are going to put all of the Social Security surplus into a lockbox and not use it for anything except Social Security.

Now we have got a lot of individuals, including the President, suggesting that we should have more spending; but everybody needs to understand that more spending means that we use the Social Security surplus money. The President suggested that we take 66 percent of the Social Security surplus and set that aside and do not spend it, but that we go ahead and we spend one-third of the Social Security surplus. This side of the aisle, the Republicans, said, no, let us try to do a little better than that, let us put a hundred percent of the Social Security surplus, trust fund surplus, aside and make sure that we do not spend it for other government programs.

I mean it is tough. We have not done this before. It would be history making if we are able to do this. Before the Republicans took the majority in 1995, for the 40 years before that the Democrats had the majority in this chamber for most every one of those years. Any time there was a surplus coming in from Social Security, it was spent for other government programs.

I chair a bipartisan task force of the Committee on the Budget on Social Security. In those hearings we learned that the Social Security Administration may be very well underestimating life span, especially how long an individual is expected to live after they reach the age of 65. Futurist medical experts were guessing that within 25 years anybody that wanted to live to be a hundred years old could make that decision to do so, and they guess that maybe within 35 years anybody that wanted to live to be 120 years old, it was within a realistic realm of possibility that they could live that long, Mr. Speaker.

See the huge consequences this will mean for any pension programs, for any government program, whether it is Social Security or Medicare or whether it is Medicaid with a huge cost, increasing cost, of nursing home care if individuals are going to live that long, because what we are faced with is a declining number of workers paying their tax in that immediately is spent out in benefits.

I mean Social Security has been a pay-as-you-go program ever since it

started in 1935. In other words, current workers pay in their taxes to pay the benefits of current retirees. When we started in 1935 and up through the 1940s, we had about 41 people working, paying in their taxes, for every one retiree. Today there is three people working paying in their taxes for every one retiree. By 2030 we are expecting that there is only going to be two people working. That means that those two people have to earn enough to provide for their families plus one retiree.

Huge challenges. Let us be careful. Let us rededicate ourselves not to spend the Social Security surplus. It is a good start.

STATE OF THE FARM ECONOMY IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to talk for a few minutes today about the state of the farm economy in America. I have listened with interest over the last hour or so to a number of Members come to the floor and speak passionately about the problems that exist in our agriculture sector of our economy across this Nation.

I am proud to hail from the east side of the State of Washington, a location which grows abundant crops, lots of grains, wheat, oats, peas and lentils and other commodities, most of which are exported overseas. When the farm bill policy of our country was adopted back in 1996, it was met, I think, with general acceptance in my part of the country, that this is a good policy change for our farmers, that they would farm for the market and not just for the Government, and the continual subsidies that had been in existence for many, many years under long-term farm policy in this country would see a change.

There would be a reduction over a period of time in the subsidies that had been provided, a marked transition payment assistance program that ultimately would get our farmers into a world market condition where the market would meet the needs, the income needs, of the farmer and not to have the farmer necessarily turn to the Government repeatedly year after year.

This was a good change. I think it was a positive change. For those of us in Congress who feel that the free market is the best way to go, a free market economy is the best, it in many respects caused some problems for our farmers because while on the one hand the Federal Government would say we are going to adopt a free market economy in agriculture, but yet we are not going to provide markets overseas for our farmers to market to, which brings me to the point that I want to make this evening:

That is that in order for our farmers to survive, those in eastern Wash-

ington as well as other parts of the country, we must have open markets. Currently our country has a policy of putting embargoes on countries with whom we disagree government to government. I happen to be proudly a member of the Committee on Appropriations, the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, which now has before it an issue regarding sanctions relief as part of the evolving policy to assist our farmers across this country.

I think our policy as a general proposition ought to be that we lift sanctions on food and medicine to countries around the world, not providing assistance government to government, but providing assistance to the people of the countries with whom we disagree and their leadership with whom we disagree, providing assistance to those countries in a market-oriented system that allows them to buy our farm products, to purchase them, not to give them, not for us to assist terrorist governments. That is not the intent of anybody in my judgment who supports lifting of sanctions, but to provide assistance to American farmers who are shut out of markets around the world that other countries are not shut out of.

So what happens is that a farmer, the government of Australia or Canada or the European Union has the ability to go into markets that we are frozen out of, American farmers are frozen out of, and underbid prices to sell products, commodities, to those countries; and then in those countries with which they can compete with us, they will undercut us even more. They will raise the prices in the sanctioned countries to get the sale, they will lower the prices in the competing countries in order to beat us out of a sale.

□ 1315

Iran is a prime example. I disagree absolutely with the government of Iran and their policies of terrorism around the world and oppression, but they are buying wheat from Canada, Australia, and the European Union. Americans are getting nothing from nor realizing any sales to this country.

So my argument is that before the Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, we have the issue of sanctions relief. I think we ought to have sanctions relief in this bill. It is an opportunity for us to say we are not going to use food and medicine as a weapon of foreign policy.

Iran cannot shoot grain back at us, but they can sure buy our grain and help our agriculture community in eastern Washington and around the country that want to sell to this country.

I know there is a problem with Cuba, and I understand that issue. And I am willing as one Member of the House to address that issue and discuss it and try to come to some reasonable solution about it, given the political consequences of some Members of the